Quaker
Tracts.

A REVIEWER REVIEWED.

THE

# Quaker Doctrine

OR THE

# INWARD LIGHT VINDICATED;

WITH SOME CRITICISM OF

Thomas Kimber's Review of an Essay by Augustine Jones, upon the Principles, Methods, and History of the Society of Friends.

BY

CHARLES E. PRATT,

BOSTON, MASS.

GEO. C. HERBERT, PUBLISHER,

No. 5 CENTRAL AVENUE,

LYNN, MASS.

1874.

PRICE, 20 CENTS.

A REVIEWER REVIEWED.

THE

# Quaker Doctrine

OF THE

# INWARD LIGHT VINDICATED;

WITH SOME CRITICISM OF

Thomas Kimber's Review of an Essay by Augustine Jones, upon the Principles, Methods, and History of the Society of Friends.

BY

CHARLES E. PRATT,

BOSTON, MASS.

GEO. C. HERBERT, PUBLISHER,

No. 5 CENTRAL AVENUE,

LYNN, MASS.

1874.

BOSTON:
PRINTED BY NATHAN SAWYER & SON,
No. 70 State Street.

Who scoffs at our birthright?—the words of the seers,
And the songs of the bards in the twilight of years,
All the fore-gleams of wisdom in santon and sage,
In prophet and priest are our true heritage.

The Word which the reason of Plato discerned;
The truth, as whose symbol the Mithra-fire burned;
The soul of the world which the stoic but guessed,
In the Light Universal the Quaker confessed.

—— *Whittier.*

# PREFATORY.

## THE REASON WHY.

THIS paper was written for *The Christian Worker*, and offered to it for publication; but the columns of that periodical are closed to it, as will appear from the following letter and reply.

27 Pemberton Square,
BOSTON, 7MO. 31, 1874.

JOSEPH POTTS,
Ed. of *Christian Worker*,
Steel Works, Dauphin Co., Pa.

DEAR FRIEND: —I have examined, with some care, the painful criticisms of Augustine Jones' Essay, by Thomas Kimber, in several numbers of the Christian Worker. I think them unfair in every charge, and unsound in reference to the Quaker doctrine of the Inward Light. That is the view held by many Friends, in this part of the country at least, who regret that so much apparent controversy has arisen, and would gladly see a statement published from another point of view. I understand that Augustine Jones will make no reply to those articles; and I have about ready a review of T. K.'s review, which by clear proofs, I think, refutes T. K.'s objections, and embodies some extracts from the accredited writings of Friends. It will take about as much space in the Christian Worker as T. K. has taken; and I write this to ask if you will give it publication in your columns, — if not because you differ with T. K., yet that both sides may be fairly heard.

I desire that nothing but truth may prevail; and that the principles of Friends as held out to the world in their writings, and believed in by the main body of the Society for two centuries, may not be misrepresented.

An early reply will very much oblige,

Truly thy friend,

CHARLES E. PRATT.

---

STEEL WORKS, PA., 8MO. 8, 1874.

CHARLES E. PRATT.

DEAR FRIEND:—In response to thine of 31st ult. I must say, that it will be impossible to give up the columns of our paper to any articles in support of the views advanced in the Discourse referred to, and controverted by T. K., although such articles should be altogether in the language of early Friends, selected with reference to the points at issue, and I am glad of this opportunity to tell thee why. We who have control of the *Worker* are entirely convinced that the decadence of our Society was owing, more than to anything else, to erroneous traditions as to what the faith of our predecessors was; which took their rise in this way: while the Christian world has moved on, through the labors of Wesley and many others, toward a general acceptance, at least in theory, of the precious doctrine of ***life and light in religion*** which it was the aim of those worthies to uphold, some Friends, desirous to preserve a singularity in our profession, have sought out and laid stress upon the extreme terms used in old time controversy; and finally succeeded in persuading themselves and others that the true foundation of faith was lightly esteemed by early Friends, and could be dispensed with by them; and that attention to inward impressions of right and wrong was the true substance of religion, even to the entire disregard of an outward revelation and atonement. An attempt to stay this desolating flood of error resulted in the great Hicksite secession, which did not extend to New England, while the tendency to such views has since been sadly apparent in some, though few, under the name of Friends, in that section. The expression given to similar sentiments

in the Discourse was painful in the extreme, and we feel under no obligation to inflict further pain upon ourselves and the mass of our readers by printing anything intended to justify such serious errors.

That you still claim to be believers in the atonement of our blessed Lord is cause of rejoicing and hope in our hearts. We earnestly invite you, with ourselves, to become the practical possessors of this Faith which our early Friends were; being fully persuaded that it will work in us, in due sequence, pardon and cleansing, and guidance into the good word and work appropriate to our day. It should be matter for serious thought with us all, that devout Christians everywhere recognize no danger so imminent at this time as the impious analysis and disregard of Divine Revelation.

I should be glad to hear from thee at any time.

Sincerely thy friend,

JOSEPH POTTS.

---

And I may take the liberty to explain, that whilst I alone am responsible for all that is contained within these covers as my own answer to the errors of T— K—, yet its publication in this form is permitted at the earnest request of several Friends, whose views accord with my own, and whose wishes I respect, and who are unwilling to see all defence of the views herein vindicated entirely suppressed.

I wish to observe also that the attitude of T— K— and his friends, and apparently also of the *Christian Worker*, is a very disingenuous one. Is it an honest one?

In the *Worker*, and in his pamphlet, it is claimed that they hold to, and wish to perpetuate, the doc-

trines of the early Friends, and that Augustine Jones has not stated them correctly. But in their correspondence, (in the above and elsewhere,) they admit that the exposition of Augustine Jones, and the views of those who agree with him, may be sustained by copious extracts from the writings of Friends; but assert that Friends have been mistaken in their teachings, which it is dangerous to revive, and that "Wesley and many others" have taught a better doctrine. Let them openly and fairly announce that they reject the principles of Fox and Penington and Whitehead and Barclay and Penn and Phipps and Tuke and Evans and Gurney and a hundred Yearly Meetings, and the spirituality of their teachings, for what themselves deem more popular and orthodox methods and forms of belief; and not endeavor to mislead by professing to be Quakers while wilfully suppressing Quaker doctrine. If the Quakerism of to-day be Methodism, let them maintain their allegiance to the outward Christ only, after the manner that their own sense of duty dictates; but let them not assail as "unsound," the disciples of the inward Christ, who, though antiquated perhaps in the view of these moderns, are true to the historical and unmistakable character of Quakerism.

I venture to say that this repression of speech and writing has been the bane of our society. This censorship of the pen and the types, attempted by

"Friends" in some quarters, is worthy of England in the seventeenth century, or of Catholicism in the Middle Ages. Who is infallible, that he may decide for the whole Society what may be said and what must be unsaid, what is truth and what is unsoundness? Where is the Quaker Vatican?

The stress of George Fox's ministry was laid upon freedom; freedom to speak, freedom to write, freedom to obey the guidance of the light within every individual man and woman.

The truth will prevail in any open conflict with error. The Society of Friends to-day is not so wanting in intelligence, in wisdom, in discernment of things pertaining to salvation, that it needs to be treated as a babe for whom all food must be prepared and fed through a self-constituted "orthodox" nipple.

I ask for no acceptance or endorsement of my views, except as they recommend themselves to the minds and hearts of unprejudiced readers. But I insist upon the liberty of hearing the truth from all points of view. I ask for a free and untrammeled press in the interests of the Society. I ask that all enquirers may have opportunity to compare the views of Friends as expounded by all earnest writers and speakers in the Society, and to eliminate for themselves the right thing from the wrong. I commend to those who would suppress all originality and freedom of speech and writing in our

Society, to the perusal of John Milton's *Areopagitica;* and to the Editors of the *Christian Worker* I commend in particular this passage: —

"There be who perpetually complain of schisms and sects, and make it such a calamity, that any man dissents from their maxims. It is their own pride and ignorance which causes the disturbing, who neither will hear with meekness, nor can convince, yet all must be suppressed which is not found in their Syntagma.

They are the troublers, they are the dividers of unity, who neglect and permit not others to unite those dissevered pieces, which are yet wanting to the body of truth. To be still searching what we know not, by what we know, still closing up truth to truth as we find it, (for all her body is homogeneal, and proportional) this is the golden rule in theology as well as in arithmetic, and makes up the best harmony in a church."

CHARLES E. PRATT.

BOSTON, Eighth-mo. 10, 1874.

---

NOTE. — In this review it has seemed necessary several times to allude to the expression "the blood of Jesus." The criticism is not of the thing, but of the manner of teaching it. "The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin," is a truth to those whom I have attempted to defend, and has been held to be a truth by Friends always, with their own spiritual interpretation. They believe, and the Essay teaches that belief, in the doctrine of the atonement of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as it was taught by Christ himself, and is set forth in the New Testament.

# A REVIEWER REVIEWED.

## The Quaker Doctrine of the Inward Light Vindicated.

"*For whosoever joineth to the light of God's Spirit cannot but witness salvation thereby; for it is of a saving nature and bringeth salvation with it to all that receive it. Christ is in it, and is known by it, (inwardly, spiritually, livingly known,) and he is not, nor can be known without it.*"

So writes Isaac Penington: (*Works*, Vol. III., page 289, Third Edition, 1784;) and on the next page he writes: "*Now this inward light is abundantly testified of in the Scriptures;*" and goes on to prove and illustrate it.

Isaac Penington is one of the saints in the Quaker calender; and his writings are quoted as authority in matters pertaining to the tenets and teachings of his Society. Through all the accredited writings of the Society of Friends, epistles, journals, treatises, from Fox to Gurney, from Barclay to Evans, runs a clear, ringing testimony to this doctrine of the Inward Light, — of its Divine origin, its universal presence in the soul of man, and its efficacy for salvation when yielded to and faithfully obeyed.

This doctrine finds a prominent place in the latest revision of "Disciplines," and in the freely distributed publications which furnish non-members, as well as friends, with authorized statements of the methods and principles of this branch of the Christian Church.

Therefore, had some inquirer asked me, — Were George Fox and Robert Barclay Quakers? — Were the doctrines most persistently preached and written by them, those of the Society of Friends? — Does the doctrine of the Inward Light embody one of their distinctive principles? I should have answered these questions unhesitatingly in the affirmative.

But the writer of several recent papers in *The Christian Worker*,* and in *Friends' Review*, has made a labored attempt to show the contrary, and to flagellate a Friend who has answered them so. His articles, however, with some renewed attention to the subject incited by them, have only confirmed me in my previous belief.

And because I believe that the Essay and the Review in question have raised an important and vital issue, which is nevertheless not a new one;† and because I believe it to be in the interest of candor and fair thinking, as well as of loyal Quakerism, that both views should be plainly presented, I wish to make some open examination of the criticisms of the Reviewer, and to add some testimony to the correctness of the Essay notwithstanding them.

It is refreshing to see a man of such Quixotic assurance of his own infallibility and flourish of impetuosity, rushing to a conflict. He sees a giant in every windmill, in every pious monk a robber.

Our Quixote finds that the Essayist "undertook to represent officially, as it were," the Society of Friends; "to step forward as an official exponent of the faith and the doctrines of its revered founders." Is that quite true? An *official* exposition would have been asked and must have proceeded from the

* These articles are since published in a pamphlet, entitled "Early Quakerism, Scriptural Christianity," &c., by Thomas Kimber, Philadelphia, Pa., published by "Friends' Publishing House," New Vienna, Ohio.

† See further on.

organized body of Friends or its duly constituted representatives. The pastor of the "Church of the Disciples" did not ask for that. He sought some person able and willing to set forth his view of the relations of the Society of Friends to the Universal Church. Augustine Jones was, for good reasons, invited to perform that duty; and he undertook it, not officially, but as a lecturer upon any other subject would have chosen and improved his theme and his occasion. He alone was responsible for the accuracy of his exposition. It was printed subsequently as an Essay,* to satisfy a large demand for copies. Now it does not matter so much whether Augustine Jones be vindicated, or his Essay approved. The simple question is, whether the Essay discloses a correct statement, so far as it could reasonably go, of the principles, methods and history of the Society of Friends, as they stand before the world in its accredited writings and practices.

It is not here the question whether Quakerism is Scriptural Christianity, or Orthodoxy, or the final and perfect development of religious practice and belief. It is simply a question of historical veracity and literary integrity.

The Reviewer, in *Christian Worker*, expressly acquits the Essayist of any *intention* "to misrepresent" or "wrong those earnest Christian Reformers, whose doctrines he has undertaken to record and expound;" and concedes that the Essay "contains much interesting information, conveyed in a sprightly (*sic*) and animated style;" and says: "For his own sake, and for the sake of the distinguished man who recommended him for that position, we shall confine ourselves to an impersonal (*sic*) and kindly examination of the literary production before us." This *seems* ingenuous and charitable. But what kind of reserve does he maintain? What acuteness of criticism, what tortures of sarcasm, what strokes of refutation, what

* See back of cover.

wondrous array of overwhelming condemnation, does he spare his victim?

On the contrary, if the Essayist were guilty of the grossest and most reckless misrepresentation, what stronger language could our Reviewer have found for his castigation within the limits of newspaper decorum ?

Let us see then in how far this first public, unsparing criticism is just as a review, and in how far it is consistent and correct in its statement of Quaker doctrine. Perhaps it, too, was "written off hand, as it were," and if not with "astonishing carelessness," yet with more astonishing bias.

So finely has our critic nibbed his pen that he finds in the Essay one word spelled with *an* instead of *en*, and another word, repeated, I believe, with *i* where there should be an *e;* both mistakes occur in familiar names of Friends, and are very easy to make, and are almost unnoticeable when made; yet our critic flourishes his pen and writes the author down as "with characteristic carelessness, misspelling both of their names."

I may add that I have had the author's manuscript before me, and that both names are therein always spelled correctly.

"With characteristic carelessness," our critic himself has made several mistakes in orthography, punctuation, and arrangement, which would scarcely be expected in a Freshman's "theme." "With characteristic carelessness" he has written "Platonists" for "Plotinus" in a quotation. "With characteristic carelessness" he writes of "the term used by him [the Essayist] so often, '*The Inner Light*,'" and repeatedly quotes it "*Inner Light*" in his papers; whereas our Essayist does *not* use the term at all, but is careful to write it always "Inward Light," exactly as it occurs in the early, classical writings of Friends.

But I leave these trifling errors, though I have noted several more. The "characteristic carelessness" of this writer, ap-

pears in graver abundance in his changes of punctuation, garbling and dislocating of sentences, and confusion in statements of facts.

The chief error in this Review is seen in the author's entire want of appreciation, almost denial of the doctrine of the Inward Light, and hence his apparent misunderstanding of the language of the Essay in setting forth that doctrine. It would be sufficient to devote this paper to meeting this main issue, were it not better that the manner and spirit of this attack should be pointed out, and that so many speciously erroneous statements should not go unanswered. I shall, therefore, notice many of these as I proceed.

Our critic begins to specify as follows: "The radical fallacy of the whole argument of this discourse may be briefly stated to be, *a confusion in the writer's expressions*, and evidently also in his mind, with regard to the term used by him so often, '*The Inner Light*.'"

I have already noted that the term which he says is used so often, occurs *not once* in the Essay. Now how a radical fallacy in argument can be a confusion of expression, or in the mind of the author, does not appear. That fallacy in argument may come of a defective understanding, is possible; but how the product and the confusion can be the same, is difficult to perceive. This allegation of confusion is far from the truth. One simple, clear, central view of the Inward Light pervades the Essay from one end to the other; and it is this very directness and clearness which so troubles the enemies of this doctrine.

But our critic, overlooking or ignoring entirely the brief but satisfactory notes appended to the Essay, goes on and misquotes, wrests detached sentences out of their proper connection, and suppresses qualifying distinctions made by the Essayist, in order to make out his false charge of confusion.

The allusion to Jacob Boehmen, is well explained in the

Essay itself. It is an interesting fact that Boehmen died when George Fox was four months old. Both were great teachers. Both were mystics, and their theology was properly termed "mystical," if it be proper for a Quaker to use the English language correctly.

Boehmen taught "that by means of an inward illumination and feeling, transcending the efforts of faith and of reason, we may immediately know, commune with, and co-operate with the Deity." He had a large number of disciples in England at that time. But the Essay does not state that George Fox was indebted to Boehmen at all for doctrines; on the contrary, it relates that the truths he taught were specially revealed to him. It notes simply the Providence of God in raising up a succession of teachers, each enjoying more light than his predecessors. Robert Barclay thought it not improper to trace the similarity of the doctrines of Friends to those of the Mystics. [*Apology*; Prop. XI. § 16.]

Again I quote from this "Review:" "Now — 'the doctrine of the Inward Light is the root out of which all the tenets of the society grow' [note that in the Essay it is "*grew*"] — adding with singular infelicity, as explanatory of the above metaphor, — 'E pluribus unum — one doctrine from many,' which is the precise contradiction of the first idea, one representing a cause, and the other an effect."

I first remark respecting this brilliant criticism, that it leaves out the beginning of the last sentence quoted from the Essay, and so confuses two statements together. The added sentence in the Essay is evidently not intended to be "explanatory of the metaphor" at all; it is a simple statement that the doctrine of the Inward Light includes all the essential saving doctrines of Christianity, is that in which they all centre. And so, being thus general, thus complete as essential doctrine, it is itself both the root out of which the "testimonies" or tenets of the society grew, and also one doctrine from many.

If our Critic had noted the difference between *doctrine* and *tenet*, he need not have rushed into such absurd criticism. There is force and perspicuity of diction gained in thus placing both statements side by side. One sometimes gets, at an angle where two truths meet, a better view of both. The statement of our Critic, "One represents a cause, and the other an effect," shows that the Critic does not comprehend the meaning of the terms *cause* and *effect*.

He proceeds to misrepresent the Essay by asserting as follows: "And yet it was this 'Inward Light' our author declares, that 'gave irresistible force to the arguments of William H. Seward; and to the phillippics pronounced against slavery and the slave power,' by Theodore Parker, 'who rejected the atonement altogether.'"

Our author declares nothing of the sort. This extract is taken from the division of the Essay, headed "Liberty of Conscience." Here it is declared that this was second to the former doctrine; and on the tenth page of the Essay it is explained that the Light and conscience are not the same. The Essay says it gave irresistible force to the arguments of these men "when they declared that there is a law higher than the statutes of men which must be obeyed;" and not at all that it was the Inward Light. However much these men erred in other things, they were eminent as exponents of "the higher law."

The Reviewer then proceeds to quote and misrepresent the following: "A scholar may wander into mazes of doubt and darkness, but if obedient to the Light, he has eternal life assured him;" commenting, — "thus obediently following the Light into mazes of doubt and darkness."

The Essayist does not say that the Light leads into darkness. If obedient to the Light manifested to him, one does his whole duty, and the Light will lead him *out* of darkness and mazes.

All persons of Christian experience know that there are mazes of doubt to be passed through. It may or may not be a result of disobedience, but it comes; and obedience leads out of it. George Fox had this period of doubt and struggle to pass through, [as also appears from our critic, *Christian Worker*, page 178; Pamphlet, p. 15,] and the Light came to him in all its fulness, and doubt and mazes disappeared.

Our critic disingenuously proceeds: "It evidently matters little in his estimation which system of Theology, or Mythology, one may prefer; the 'Light' is the same, and 'obedience to it insures salvation.'" To this I only say that the view set forth in the Essay itself, is the same as is taught by Robert Barclay in his Apology (Prop. V. and VI., §§ 27 and 28) and by every other doctrinal writer of the Society of Friends.

But I purpose to offer some suggestions further on, regarding the doctrine of the Inward Light and the conflicting views in relation to it.

Hardly knowing how to show it, but still persistent in his notion that the Essay is pernicious, our critic in the next paper kindly ejaculates: "It is so full of errors and misstatements, that, at every turn of the leaves, a feeling of confusion almost paralyzes the attempt regularly to criticise it."

Now what does he produce to sustain this sweeping averment? Anxious to air his scriptural acquisitions, he quotes this passage from the Essay: "The fierce zeal of Elijah the Tishbite, was nurtured three years in the wild loneliness of the hills of Gilead, before he confronted the wicked Ahab and idolatrous Israel with the purposes of Jehovah;" with "characteristic carelessness" changing the author's punctuation entirely; and devotes several paragraphs to the attempt to show the "utter baselessness of all this elaborate flourish." True, Elijah did confront Ahab at the beginning of the three years, telling him of the impending drought. But "idolatrous

Israel" was not there, until the meeting in Mount Carmel, three years and six months later, when they were both confronted. Now whether Elijah dwelt six months in Sarepta, a city of Sidon, and three years by "a pleasant brook near the banks of the Jordan," is not known. But the locality of that brook is as uncertain as that of the garden of Eden, or the grave of Moses; although our critic says it is "a pleasant brook," and seems well acquainted with it. It was probably a brook running from the hills of Gilead into the Jordan; though it is by some authorities placed on the western side of the Jordan. The idea in the Essay was well illustrated by the life of Elijah, and no doubt more would have been made of the illustration had there been space. The wild life in Gilead was quite different from that on the western side of the Jordan.

The discipline of Elijah's life, with the gift of divine grace in his heart, produced a wonderful character. But the resemblance of George Fox to him, is more in the fact that they were both alone, and for a time without religious fellowship or following. Elijah says when in Mount Horeb, "The children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only am left; and they seek my life to take it away." And then came the wind, the earthquake, the fire, and lastly the "still small voice." Thus each of these men was far in advance of the generation in which he lived, and was much alone in divine communion.

The Reviewer again becomes excited over the expression, "He solved for himself the problem presented to us all,—'Given self to find God;'" and immediately concludes that it implies salvation by good works alone, or by a mere intellectual process; whereas the Essay teaches the contrary doctrine. It teaches that salvation depends on what Christ has done for us without us, the result of which is made ours through the operation of the Light of his Spirit in our hearts and obedience

thereto. There is no contradiction in the voice which Fox heard: — "There is One, even Christ Jesus, who can speak to thy condition." Fox had been searching for light, and it came. Unless he had struggled for the full divine revelation, he would never have had it. God gives us nothing without requiring something of us. We must "work out our own salvation;" we must "strive to enter in at the straight gate;" we must "open the door;" we must "walk in the light, as He is in the light." The very same experience of George Fox which the critic adduces as unfamiliar to our Essayist, is recited in the Essay. And this "obedience" spoken of, is not described by the Essayist as bare acts of obedience, as of one doing what is commanded; but as "the obedience of faith," the loving, sympathetic spirit of obedience, which infuses itself into the whole life and action and thought, and prompts to obey even where there is no command.

And I recall, in this connection, the words of Thomas Evans: "By the mighty work of Christ within us, the power, nature, and habits of sin are destroyed; that as sin once reigned unto death, even so now grace reigneth, through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord. All this is effected, *not by a bare or naked act of faith, separate from obedience, but in the obedience of faith;* Christ being the author of eternal salvation to none but those that obey him." [*Concise Account;* p. 41.]

On page 178 of the *Christian Worker*, [Pamphlet, p. 16,] our critic draws a wonderful picture of a wonderful sort of "self-confidence" as "especially observable in New England." To this attempt at a sweeping rebuke to New England, I simply reply, let the Reviewer look in his own mirror and ask himself whether there is not quite as notable "self-confidence" somewhere outside of New England.

Notice, too, with what a pedantic air our Critic points to a

line in the Essay, which is simply a literary allusion, and wholly immaterial to any argument or statement of doctrine; announces that he has not met with the quoted remark in his own reading of three authors; and "would softly inquire—when and where did Napoleon ever make this remark?"

*We* would "softly inquire," might not Napoleon have made the remark and our Critic not remember where it is reported? Might not the remark be credibly attributed to Napoleon, notwithstanding a similar story has been told of another great conqueror long before? There lies a book on my table in which the remark is attributed to Napoleon by a learned British author of quite as respectable attainments as our Critic; and if the latter possessed the omniscience to which he lays claim, he would recollect meeting it even in writings upon Quakerism. But whether it be an error or not, it is not worth the while either to refute or to sustain it, as it might be stricken out and not affect the meaning of the sentence in which it occurs.

Referring now to page 196 of the *Christian Worker*, [Pamphlet, p. 37,] "*we* would softly inquire, when and where did" Christ ever "*declare himself* to be the Prince of Peace?"

In another pedantic paragraph the Reviewer takes up his dictionary to make out the meaning of "Parish" and "Preparative." Now a Preparative Meeting is held in the neighborhood where its members live, and is usually made up of those only who live near together and attend meetings regularly at the same meeting-house, and is for the transaction of business pertaining to that neighborhood of Friends, and is the primary or first in order of business meetings. So it is in these respects like a Parish Meeting; and it was not incorrect or inapt, in addressing people more familiar with the latter name, to explain the former by it. The Essayist does not say the names, or the things, are "identical."

In regard to the interview of Alexander I. with William Allen, and the work of Elizabeth Fry among British prisoners, which it takes our Reviewer so long to criticise to so little point, I have only to say, *first*, that it was impossible for the Essayist within his allotted space, to quote a large part of the Life of William Allen and the Memoirs of Stephen Grellet; and, *secondly*, that I appeal to any fair and intelligent person to read the authorities quoted by T. K., without his comments, and then the passage or two of the Essay so much criticized, and say if there is any such perversion or disparagement of the gospel labors and teachings of those worthy Friends, or of the depth and reality of their Christian experience and feelings, as is alleged by this prejudiced Critic.

On page 193 of the *Christian Worker* [Pamphlet, p. 26] the Reviewer quotes the following passage of the Essay: "When he died, 'the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom,' 'blotting out the hand writing of ordinances' forever. Henceforth the holy Shechinah dwelt not on the mercy seat between the cherubim in a temple made with hands, but more abundantly in the soul of every man of every race;" and asserts that "neither of these assertions is scriptural or correct; or in accordance with the faith and doctrines of George Fox and our early Friends."

Two of these "assertions" were quoted from scripture by the Essayist; and the others are, I think, both scriptural and in accordance with the faith and doctrines of our early Friends.

The participle "blotting" evidently follows the scripture language from which it is quoted, and relates to the idea instead of the word. He means, the handwriting of ordinances was blotted out forever. But the slight sacrifice of grammar is, perhaps, better than a sacrifice of exactness in the quotation.

In the Jewish Temple, the Shechinah was the *abiding*, the local *presence* of God between the cherubim. When Jesus

cried "It is finished," the old *regime* of ordinances, and temple worship, and outward ceremonial, were done away.

George Fox says, in his *Journal*, [Vol. I., p. 53, Seventh London Edition.] "But the Lord showed me clearly, that He did not dwell in these temples which men had commanded and set up, but in people's hearts; for both Stephen and the Apostle Paul bore testimony, that He did not dwell in temples made with hands, not even in that which He had once commanded to be built, since He put an end to it; but that His people were His temple, and He dwelt in them." And a few pages further on (p. 108) Fox says: "Whereas they should have looked for God and Christ to dwell *in* their hearts."

And see also *Barclay's Apol.*, Prop. XI., Sect. XV., and Prop. VII., Sect. V., *Bates' Doctrines;* p. 176, 177.

Again, our Reviewer quotes from page 26 of the Essay, — "He (Paul) might have disobeyed the command, remained in Greece, and saved his life. But he said further, 'Neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy.'" And then with a reckless waste and misuse of language adds: "It does not require the knowledge of a student of 'Conybeare and Howson' to unravel the labyrinth of errors in this short extract" — and more of the like.

If "T. K." had the candor of "any Sabbath-school scholar," he would see nothing to criticise in the paragraph. He does not seem to realize that Paul had been in Greece at all. When Paul was at Ephesus, in Asia Minor, he "purposed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem," &c. [Acts. XIX., 21.] "And when he had gone over those parts [Macedonia, &c.] and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece, and there abode three months," [Acts. XX., 2, 3.] Then he went by way of Miletus and Caesarea to Jerusalem. The language quoted by the Essayist as Paul's, was all spoken on that same journey. Greece was the farthest point of the journey from Jerusalem;

Paul tarried there three months; and he certainly *might have remained* there, yielding to the dissuasion of his friends, had he been willing to be disobedient to his calling, and save his life by unfaithfulness. Now the paragraph in the Essay becomes plain, and we see that "said further" does not mean said afterwards, or later or further in time; but "further" in thought in reference to the same subject. Paul not only could say he was ready "to die at Jerusalem, for the name of the Lord Jesus," but he "said further" than that, in his self-renunciation, "Neither count I my life dear unto myself."

The Reviewer [on page 216 of the *Christian Worker*, Pamphlet, p. 37] pronounces incorrect the statement that in the business meetings of Friends there is "no president but the Inward Light;" and adds, as if to show the contrary, that "in all of them, there is a chief clerk, whose office it is to preserve the order, and to introduce, and record the business of the meeting."

Why he should say "*chief* clerk," I do not see, as the style of that officer is simply "clerk," who, to be sure, frequently has an assistant, styled "assistant clerk." The duties of the "clerk" correspond very nearly with those of the secretary or recording officer in any deliberative body; and in no genuine Friends' Meeting does he exercise the usual functions of a "president."

Thomas Evans, of Philadelphia, has long been recognized as an authority among the writers of the Society; and he says, in his "*Concise Account*," etc., (authorized reprint, page 23:) "No one is appointed president in any of the meetings for discipline of the Society; as Friends believe that Christ Jesus alone ought to preside, and His spirit and wisdom only to govern, in all such assemblies. . . . . The person appointed as clerk, is to gather and record the solid sense and judgment of Truth as manifested in the meeting; but no vote is ever taken, nor is any question decided by numbers." That

this has always been their method, may be well understood from the language used by William Penn [*Rise and Progress*, p. 47] : "It is further to be noted, that in these solemn assemblies [meetings for business] for the Churches' service, there is no one presides among them after the manner of assemblies of other people; Christ only being their President, as He is pleased to appear in life and wisdom in any one or more of them; to whom, whatever be their capacity or degree, the rest adhere with a firm unity, not of authority, but conviction, which is the divine authority and way of Christ's power and Spirit in his people."

This inward Christ, this manifestation of God's presence and influence by his Son in the soul of man, is the Inward Light; "Christ" and "the Light" are interchangeable terms with Penn, and Barclay, and Fox, as will be more fully shown hereafter.

And so it appears that the Essayist condensed a truth into a sentence; and our Quixote here as elsewhere, in his impetuosity of mistaken attack, finds himself dashed to the ground.

This is also the case in his very next paragraph, [*Christian Worker*, p. 217; Pamphlet, p. 37,] in his learned and acute criticism of the use of the words "great prototype" in the Essay. With his habitual inaccuracy, giving the words capital letters, and setting them in a different connection from that which the Essayist gave them, he charges the latter with "an astonishing ignorance," "or a still more amazing heresy;" and explains "that the type or figure of a thing is always inferior to the thing itself;" and "that an end was made of all types and shadows, when the Lord Jesus Christ came to answer and fulfil them." *All* types? or the types and shadows of the Jewish ceremonial, and those which foreshadowed Christ himself?

But "type" and "prototype" are different words, with quite distinctly different meanings. That incomparable product of

good definitions from scholarly minds, known as "Webster's Unabridged," defines "prototype" as meaning *pattern, exemplar, archetype;* and gives, in illustration, the words of Burke, "They will turn their backs on it, like their great precursor and prototype;" and under the word archetype the sentence of South: "Types and shadows of that glorious archetype that was to come into the world." If the Critic had here taken up his Greek lexicon once more, he would have seen the force of the word "prototype" from its composition. But it needs no explanation for any one else to see that the use of the words in the Essay was correct and scriptural, and accordant with the teachings of Friends. Robert Barclay does not fail to speak of "that excellent pattern which he hath left us, 'who suffered for us,' as saith the apostle Peter, 1 Pet. ii, 21, 'leaving us an example that we should follow his steps.'"

The Reviewer is greatly troubled about the assertion in the Essay, that "a marked characteristic of the Society is the absence of creed," and the following remark in describing the organization of the Society: "Thus the foundation was laid for an organization without creed, except the Inward Light." He declares these assertions to be "without a shadow of foundation in fact."

Here is at least a "shadow," in what William Penn put forth, in his "Rise and Progress of the Society of Friends," first written as an introduction to George Fox's Journal: "The bent and stress of their (the early Friends') Ministry was conversion to God, regeneration, and holiness; *not schemes of doctrines and verbal creeds*, or new forms of worship; but a leaving off in religion the superfluous, and reducing the ceremonious and formal part, and pressing earnestly the substantial, the necessary and profitable part; as all upon a serious reflection must and do acknowledge."

And Joseph John Gurney, in his Introduction to the Seventh Edition of his "*Observations*," takes occasion to say: "Since

the Holy Scriptures contain a divinely authorized standard of revealed truth, and are fully sufficient for their purpose, *Friends have always refused to bind themselves by any other written creed.*"

The Reviewer alleges George Fox's letter to the Governor of Barbadoes, Barclay's "Catechism" and "Confession of Faith," and a passage from William Penn's "Defence of Gospel Truth" which states that Friends believe in most of the "Thirty Nine Articles" and in the "Apostles' Creed;" as if that were enough to refute the Essayist on this point.

But these are all declarations of individuals, afterwards quoted approvingly by others; and Fox's letter has been formally approved by portions of the Society. That Friends believe these things, as alleged, I do not deny. They also believe many other things. In particular, they believe the whole Bible. But that cannot properly be called a creed. They have never formally adopted, as a whole Society, any statement of doctrines, like the Apostles' Creed, the Athanasian Creed, the Thirty Nine Articles; or the Catechisms and Points of Doctrine, upon which most of the sects examine candidates for admission and require assent to. There is no formal summary of dogmatic belief which the Society requires its members to accept, or which is repeated from time to time in all the meetings.

Yet our Essayist is right in excepting from his statement of absence of creed, their belief in the Inward Light, which is pre-eminently their creed, if any such they have. We might speak of the One Point of Quakerism with as much correctness as we may of the Five Points of Calvinism.

George Fox wrote to the King of England, in 1674, "*The principle* of the Quakers is the Spirit of Christ, who died for us, and is risen for our justification; by which we know we are His. He dwelleth in us by His Spirit, and by the Spirit of Christ we are led out of unrighteousness and ungodliness."

And William Penn, in his "*Rise and Progress*," declares

the "Light of Christ within" to be the "corner stone," the "fundamental principle," the "characteristic, or main distinguishing point or principle."

Whoever will take the trouble to turn to and compare the different "Propositions" which make up the substance of Barclay's Apology, will see that this principle of the universal, saving Light runs through them all like a life current. The highest generalization of all the doctrines set forth in his treatise, would be a statement of the origin, attributes, and influences, of the Inward Light.

In his hasty inconsistency the Reviewer censures, in one paragraph, the alleged belief of some "that a man may believe what he pleases, so that he is sincere;" and in the next, avers with the emphasis of italics that the only salvation is "through faith in the atonement, resurrection, ascension and mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ; *and that if a man is sincere he must and will believe it.*"

A similar feat of simplicity and dullness is exhibited upon page 195 of the *Christian Worker*, [Pamphlet, p. 31,] where the writer admits in so many words the truth of the statements which he is laboring to controvert, saying, "We freely admit that by virtue of the atonement, made on Mt. Calvary for the sins of the whole world, a measure of Divine Light and Grace is given to every man, by obedience to which he may be accepted and saved — for the Redeemer's sake — even though he has never known of His outward offering."

He charges that this Essay testifies of an Inward Light which was "at once the inspiration of a wily politician; and of a notorious Free thinker — so radical that even the Unitarian Church of Boston disowned him;" a charge which is false in every particular.

He says, "the whole Society of Friends, in this country, has been shaken to its foundation, and been actually divided, — on the very question of the *Inner Light* that this Essay has again

raised," referring to the Hicksite controversy. [*Christian Worker*, page 194; Pamphlet, p. 30.]

Now I think that controversy was not over this doctrine chiefly, or at all; but lest my opinion should not have weight, as that war was waged many years ago, I will adduce the testimony of a witness who was himself an officer in the field. Thomas Evans says that the "doctrines" held by the Hicksites to be "sound" and by the remaining body of Friends to be "unsound," were "certain opinions promulgated by Elias Hicks, denying or invalidating the miraculous conception, divinity, and atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also the authenticity and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures." ["*Concise Account*," p. 31.]

Throughout his papers this doughty critic betrays a sneering arrogance, never learned from his New Testament, nor caught from the writings of Friends. He takes up his pen with a suggestion of kindly excuse, and before long charges the object of his attack with "an utter failure to comprehend, or even properly to search for," the declarations and teachings of the founders of the Society of Friends, and avers that "it evidently matters little, in his [the Essayist's] estimation, which system of Theology, or Mythology, one may prefer." He first acquits of any intention to misrepresent, and then charges with "repeated misquotation, and misapplication of Scripture," with "astonishing ignorance," "amazing heresy," and with being "latitudinarian" and a "Free thinker." With one arm he would embrace, and with the other he would plunge the dagger. But his thrusts are harmless, for his criticisms are but the gleams of a tinsel sword which glides harmless by or is shattered at the first test.

I have shown how weak and untenable and mistaken are his criticisms upon the Essay, in matters of style, illustration, and

fact; and having thus shown his utter unreliability as a witness for the truths in controversy, I propose to show that he is either rashly perverse in his treatment of the doctrine of the Inward Light, or else without any intelligent understanding of the first principles of Quakerism, and in utter lack of comprehension of the language and teaching of the Essay, which he so flippantly denounces.

With exquisite complacency the Reviewer commends his own "series of recent articles in *Friends' Review*" as "covering this ground so thoroughly," and again makes the conclusion of his criticism an advertisement of "these important extracts." Those extracts are indeed interesting, disconnected as they are; and I would commend, as interesting to be read at the same time, some extracts from the Journal of George Fox, furnished by another Friend, and appearing in *Friends' Review*, Vol. XXVII., No. 43. And with the quotations in this Review, (which I have felt compelled to criticise considerably,) so far as they are accurately and fairly made, I have no fault to find. If the Review is instructive at all, it is chiefly in its extracts. For with all his changes of punctuation, garbling and dislocating of sentences, and free use of *italics*, the Reviewer cannot keep this doctrine out of sight, or persuade any intelligent reader that it was not taught by the early and later Friends substantially as it was stated by the Essayist. Not in the same language always. It is one of the merits of the Essayist that he endeavors to speak in the language of his countrymen to-day, and not always in the theological diction of a century or two ago. Principles need to be re-stated for every generation, just as worn type needs to be melted down and recast so as to make a clearer and better impression.

There are some minds, however, which cannot recognize an old friend in a new garb; who are afraid of any form of language other than that to which they are accustomed. They suspect every newly stamped coin to be spurious.

I think T — K — misunderstood, at first, the language of the

Essay, partly because it did not sound quite like that which he himself had been wont to employ, and partly, perhaps, from sharing a not very rare impression that it is a matter of censure or suspicion for a Quaker to speak or write good literary English; and so he hastily condemned it. I took occasion to call him to order for this rashness, in a brief communication which appeared in the *Christian Worker*, (Vol. IV., No. 10,) and to express my approval of the Essay, and the approval of many others. Since then the Reviewer has opposed the Essay with the resoluteness of a partisan.

But this difference, this antagonism, is not one merely of words. It is a conflict of doctrines. Side by side in the same Society, housed under one roof, are two differing modes of thought, apparently without much collision for a time. A man of ability brings his best thought, with clearness and logical directness, to the vital question; and at once the minds which are charged with these different modes, arrange themselves at opposite poles. The one part, true to the long cherished and distinctive views of Friends, clings to the "inward Christ;" the other, swerved by more popular and Methodistical tendencies, holds to the "outward Christ." These latter, of whom the Reviewer appears to be one, see nothing but "the blood of Jesus." They look upon the tragedy of Mount Calvary in its outward and material significance, and in their emotional devotion to this historical sacrifice and outward and historical atonement, they are blinded to the eternal Spirit of Christ, his light, life, and grace in the souls of men, of which the vicarious suffering of Christ's body was but the culminating outward incident.

They know Christ after the flesh, but not in the fulness of the Spirit. They are of those described as "resting too much in a mere historical belief of the blessed doctrines of the gospel, the birth, life, miracles, sufferings, death, resurrection, ascension, mediation, intercession, atonement, and divinity of the

Lord Jesus; but had not sufficiently looked for, and abode under, the heartchanging and sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit or Comforter;" as "improperly depending upon a bare belief of what Christ had done and suffered for them when personally on earth, and also on the ceremonies of religion, without sufficiently pressing after the knowledge of "Christ in them, the hope of Glory;" but of whom it is said, "as they attended in simple obedience to the discoveries of this Divine Light, they were [will be] gradually led to see farther into the spirituality of the gospel dispensation." [Evans; *Concise Account;* p. 13.]

The Reviewer, like all of his mode of thought, finds a great charm in the words "orthodox," "evangelical," and the like, and has a fearful reverence for the indefinite ideas represented by them; and quickly pronounces those with whom he disagrees to be "latitudinarians," "free-thinkers," and other names so easy to call and yet so hard to apply with just discernment. He is less anxious to show that Friends believe in the distinctive principles of Quakerism, than that they hold the same faith, in the same form of words, and the same scheme of doctrine, as the Methodists, for instance, the other sects with whom they co-operate in works and missions of religious and charitable beneficence. They are much more willing to be "peculiar" in some non-essential manners and customs, than in matters of vital principle and doctrine. According to his representation there is not distinguishing difference enough in the views of Friends to furnish them an excuse for their existence as a Society apart from the other, "orthodox," "evangelical" sects. For all that he is willing to admit they might as well have been Episcopalians, or turned Wesleyans, so far as any matter of faith or creed is concerned.

He and his class dwell with exclusive and fervent emphasis on "the cleansing blood of Christ shed on Mount Calvary,"

and all the repertory of the revivalist's and evangelist's dramatic and ear-catching pictures and phrases; and insist that we are saved, if at all, by the death of Christ; whereas the scriptural and Quaker doctrine is that we are "reconciled by his death but *saved by his life*."

The publications from which they derive their expressions and their cast of thought in religious matters, are those of the American Tract Society and the various Sunday School presses. Indeed I find the very doctrine which T. K. urges, much more clearly set forth, because more ingenuously, in one of these publications which I have at hand and from which I quote the following specimen passages; taken almost at random, viz: —

"Again, I repeat, your eye of faith must now be directed entirely, out of and from yourself, to Jesus. Beware of looking for any preparation to meet death in yourself. It is all in Christ. God does not accept you on the ground of a broken heart, or a clean heart, or a praying heart, or a believing heart. He accepts you wholly and entirely on the ground of the atonement of his blessed Son."

"No doubt, the quickening presence of the Holy Spirit is most essential to your seeing Jesus, to the saving of your soul; and you should by all means expect his gracious presence to be vouchsafed as you contemplate the crucified Redeemer; but it is unscriptural to seek the sanctification of your heart through the Spirit before the justification of your person through Christ; and it is equally unscriptural to mix the two, and depend partly on one and partly on the other; for Jesus, and Jesus only, is the object on which your anxious eyes must rest for peace with God and a change of heart."

"In the Westminster Assembly's Shorter catechism, which is considered by all orthodox people to be an excellent summary of Christian doctrine, you will find the very same truth stated which we have advanced."

"We should never direct an anxious sinner to look to the

Spirit as his Saviour, but to Christ alone; never direct an inquirer to seek first an *inward* change, but an *outward* one."

"The blood of Jesus is the ground of peace with God to every believing sinner below, and it will be the subject of the everlasting song of the redeemed above."

"The bloodshedding of Jesus 'as a propitiation for our sins,' lies at the very threshold of the Christian life. It is the alphabet of Christian experience to know 'the blood of sprinkling.'"

"The blood of Jesus is our great and only theme."

"It is of the last importance to be clear as to the fact, that it is the work of Christ *without* you, and not the work of the Spirit *within* you, that must form the sole ground of your deliverance from guilt and wrath, and of peace with God."

"All prayer is acceptable with God, *and only so, as it comes up perfumed with the blood of Christ;* all prayer is answered as it urges the *blood* of Christ as its plea; it is the *blood* of Christ that satisfies justice, and meets all the demands of the law against us; it is the *blood* of Christ that purchases and brings down every blessing into the soul; it is the *blood* of Christ that sues for the fulfilment of his last will and testament, every precious legacy of which comes to us solely on account of his *death;* this it is, too, that gives us boldness at the throne of grace. How can a poor sinner approach without this? How can he look up?—how can he ask?—how can he present himself before a holy God?—*but as he brings in the hand of faith the precious blood of Jesus.*"

"*Make mention of the blood of Jesus*, and you may rest satisfied that you have the petitions that you 'desired of him.'"

[*The Blood of Jesus;* by Rev. William Reid. Published by the American Tract Society. Pp. 26, 27, 47, 53, 69, 118, 120, 126, 127.]

This is a specimen of the literature and the preaching that is taken up and encouraged and written by our Reviewer and that class of fervent, neophyte Quakers to which he seems to belong.

No wonder that when a lucid statement of the trunk doctrine of Quakerism is presented to them, they disown it. The Reviewer is forced to admit that it is sound Quakerism that the heathen may be saved by the influences of the Inward Light through obedience to such measure of it as they have. Now, then, are there two methods or ways of salvation? Is there one door to righteousness and heaven for the heathen, or the deaf mute, or the blind, or the imprisoned; and another to the intelligent Bible-read Christian? Let them assent to the full statement of Robert Barclay, and not the half of it, where he sums it up so tersely: "Our theme then hath two parts; First, *That those that have the Gospel and Christ outwardly preached unto them*, ARE NOT SAVED BUT BY THE WORKING OF THE GRACE AND LIGHT IN THEIR HEARTS. Secondly, *That by the working and operation of this, many have been, and some may be saved, to whom the gospel hath never been outwardly preached, and who are utterly ignorant of the outward history of Christ.*" [*Apology;* Prop. VI., Sect. XXIV.]

I have thought it better thus calmly, and in detail, to refute the erroneous criticisms of the Reviewer, and not to answer him in the spirit of his own attack; to be neither sarcastic, nor acerb, neither arrogant, nor hypocritical. The question is too grave for flippancy. The truth is never well defended by flinging adjectives. Boys, and men who have no less vincible arms, contend by calling names.

I refrain, as I know the Essayist would, from any personal retort, and spare him many pointed thrusts to which my pen would leap. But if he calls us, who believe the doctrine of the Inward Light, "latitudinarians," "liberals," "free-thinkers;" he should also remember that there are epithets quite as opprobrious for the other extreme; and not be discomfited if, with the same acrimonious ink, we write him down as a pharisee, a bigot, a creed-bound dogmatist.

By those religious denominations which are what the Reviewer calls orthodox and evangelical, the Quakers and their teachings have always been pronounced latitudinarian and unscriptural. From the days of George Whitehead to those of Joseph Phipps or Benjamin Seebohm, and from the time of George Keith's defection to that of Robert Charleton, they have been compelled to defend their views, both out of the Scriptures and out of reason and Christian experience, from the attacks of those within as well as those without their ranks.

And the well-read Quaker knows that the objective point of controversy has been this doctrine of the Inward Light oftener than any other.

Their literature is full of it; and *Robert Barclay Vindicated* is the constant result. Nor do they hold forth his *Catechism*, so often quoted by the Reviewer, which is a small and comparatively obscure book; but the *Apology*, which the Reviewer has so much held aloof from, and which was commended in the Philadelphia *Friend*, in 1868, in these words: —

"Barclay's Apology for the True Christian Divinity has, for nearly two hundred years, withstood the attacks of those without the pale of our religious Society, who longed to overturn its plain, scriptural, self-denying doctrines, and of those within that pale, who have denied the faith of Friends, or sought to bring in new theories of their own. . . . It has always been accepted by the Society as a clear exposition of the doctrines of Holy Scripture, as Friends understand them; and we think it an unkind and dishonorable course, while openly denying the religious belief which the Society, from generation to generation, has adhered to and promulgated; while charging the standard work, acknowledged by the Society to set forth its belief plainly and truly, with being unsound, . . . they [R. Charleton and others,] should persist in representing themselves as Friends, and thus induce other religious professors to believe, that the Society has abandoned its original principles, and substituted others more nearly conforming with their own."

The correctness of the Essayist's statements in regard to the Inward Light, is well shown in the brief but pertinent notes to the Essay, citing authorities, which the Reviewer entirely ignored. But as some may read this discussion of the question, who have not the Essay at hand, I will quote here the leading statements of the Essayist about this Light:

"George Fox says, in 1648, 'The Lord opened to me by His invisible power that every man was enlightened by the Divine Light of Christ.' This principle is the 'Inward Light,' and is the fundamental doctrine of the Society of Friends. It is the light spoken of by St. John, 'which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.'" [*Essay*, p. 9.]

"Friends do not believe the Inward Light to be the conscience or any other natural faculty of man, but an exotic obtained and placed in the soul by the sacrifice of Christ; which Light is none other than the living Christ within, 'the hope of glory;' and that the shedding of blood, blood being a symbol of life, was only a part of that sacrifice, which was both physical and spiritual, and in its elemental combination of parts a divine mystery, such that we have no authority for saying that this element thereof or that is sufficient to save men, 'all being parts of one stupendous whole.' And that this salvation is not attained by a naked act of faith apart from obedience, but in the obedience of faith. They also hold that Light to be both universal and saving; universal because it is in every man of every capacity in every age of the world; and saving because it has in it the power and virtue of the atonement. But they nevertheless believe that it saves only those obedient to it." [*Essay*, p. 10.]

"The doctrine of the Inward Light, as already suggested, was the root out of which all the tenets of the society grew."

"It was *E pluribus unum*, one doctrine from many. It had in itself the healing virtue to restore man to the purity of the first Adam, and to secure to him a home with the redeemed of all generations in the endless life. As old ocean, with its fresh,

flowing tide, visits every bay and inlet, bearing health, so the Infinite Spirit flows to every human heart, with the overture of eternal life." [*Essay*, p. 13, 14.]

"The doctrines of repentance, faith and second birth are each necessary results or concomitants of obedience to the Light."

"The doctrine of the Inward Light is believed by Friends to be the great central idea of that last dispensation, and they believe that there has been no higher truth revealed since. That Christ died to secure the salvation of men by this Light."

"It is not simply a Teacher, Comforter and Purifier, but also a King, Priest and Mediator, with all the healing power of Christ and the atonement." [*Essay*, p. 36, 37.]

But I must commend the reader to the Essay itself, believing that it is a valuable, lucid and thought-stirring setting-forth of those things which it professes to touch upon; and content myself with adducing, in conclusion, *a few* extracts from the accredited testimonies of Friends, to show that the Essayist's representations are true.

George Fox testifies: "Now the Lord God opened to me by his invisible power, that *every man* was enlightened by the divine light of Christ; and I saw it shine through all; and they that believed in it came out of condemnation to the light of life, and became the children of it; but they that hated it, and did not believe in it, were condemned by it, though they made a profession of Christ. This I saw in the pure openings of the light, without the help of any man; neither did I then know where to find it in the Scriptures, though afterwards, searching the Scriptures, I found it. For I saw in that Light and Spirit which was before the Scriptures were given forth, and which led the holy men of God to give them forth, that all must come to that Spirit, if they would know God, or Christ, or the Scriptures aright, which they that gave them forth were led and taught by." [*Journal;* Vol. I., p. 70, Seventh London Edition.]

"I saw that Christ died for all men, and was a propitiation for all; and enlightened all men and women with his *divine and saving* light; and that none could be a true believer, but who believed in it." [*Id. id.*, p. 71.]

"I declared to them, that every one that cometh into the world, was enlightened by Christ the life; . . . . and the day of the Lord was come, and Christ was come to teach his people himself by his light, grace, power, and spirit." [*Id. id.*, p. 156.]

"I was glad that I was commanded to turn people to that *inward light*, Spirit, and grace, *by which all might know salvation*, and their way to God; even that Divine Spirit which would *lead them into all truth.*" [*Id. id.*, p. 71.]

William Penn says: "The light of Christ within, who is the light of the world, leads all that take heed unto it, out of darkness into God's marvellous light. For light grows upon the obedient." "Well! and what does this blessed light do for you? Why, first, it sets all your sins in order before you. . . . Secondly, it begets a sense and sorrow, in such as believe in it, for this fearful lapse. . . . Thirdly, after this it will bring you to the holy watch, to take care that you do so no more, and that the enemy surprise you not again. Then thoughts, as well as words and works, will come to judgment. . . . Here you will come to love God above all, and your neighbors as yourselves." [*Rise and Progress;* pp. 83, 84.]

I began this Essay with the testimony of Isaac Penington, which I will not repeat, or add to; though in his writings as in all which I quote from, the expressions of this same doctrine are abundant, and these selections are but samples.

In 1693 a quasi official statement of doctrine was put forth by the Society, in London, carefully drawn to acquit themselves of errors charged against them by George Keith; from

which I select this passage: — "Where the least degree or measure of this light and life of Christ within is sincerely waited in, followed and obeyed, there is a blessed increase of light and grace known and felt; as the path of the just it shines more and more unto the perfect day; and thereby a growing in grace, and in the knowledge of God, and of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, hath been, and is truly experienced. And this *light, life, or Spirit of Christ within, (for they are one divine principle,) is sufficient to lead unto all truth; having in it the divers ministrations both of judgment and mercy, both of law and gospel, even that gospel which is preached in every intelligent creature under heaven.*" [*Sewel's History;* Vol II., p. 354.]

Robert Barclay is the most eminent, most scholarly, and most widely recognized doctrinal writer of the Society. After his death George Fox endorsed him and his writings by writing, in 1690, "A Testimony concerning our Dear Brother in the Lord, Robert Barclay, who was a Wise and Faithful Minister of Christ, and Writ many Precious Books in the Defence of the Truth . . . who was a Man I very much Loved for his Labor in the Truth."

His "*Apology*" was his principal work. It has been published and circulated in seven different languages, to my knowledge, and in scores of editions. It has been approved as a standard exposition of the doctrines of Friends for almost two centuries, and is the first book on the Quaker shelf to-day. About one-sixth of this treatise is devoted to the special elucidation of this doctrine of the Inward Light; and all the rest is pervaded by this central idea. From this universally approved and much-quoted treatise I briefly cite as follows:

"The inward and immediate revelation of God's Spirit, speaking in and unto the saints, was by them believed as the ground and foundation of their hope in God, and life eternal." "The same continueth to be the object of the saints' faith unto

this day." "The object of the saints' faith is the same in all ages, though held forth under divers administrations." "The ancients believed in Christ with respect to his appearance outwardly as future, and we as already appeared; for neither did they then so believe in him to come, as not to feel him present with them, and witness him near; seeing the apostle saith, 'They all drank of that spiritual rock which followed them, which rock was Christ;' nor do we so believe concerning his appearance past, as not to feel and know him present with us." [*Proposition II., Sects. VIII and IX.*]

"From these revelations of the Spirit of God to the saints have proceeded the Scriptures of Truth." "They are only a declaration of the fountain, and not the fountain itself, therefore they are not to be esteemed the principal ground of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the adequate primary rule of faith and manners." "They are and may be esteemed a secondary rule, subordinate to the Spirit, from which they have all their excellency and certainty; for as by the inward testimony of the Spirit we do alone truly know them, so they testify, that the Spirit is that Guide by which the saints are led into all truth; therefore, according to the Scriptures, the *Spirit is the first and principal leader.*" [Prop. III.]

"This most certain doctrine being then received, that there is an evangelical and *saving light* and grace in all, the universality of the love and mercy of God towards mankind, both in the death of his beloved son the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the manifestation of the light in the heart, is established and confirmed, against all the objections of such as deny it." [Prop. VI.]

"We have said before how that a divine, spiritual, and supernatural light is *in all men;* how that that divine supernatural light or seed is *vehiculum Dei;* how that *God and Christ dwelleth in it, and is never separated from it.*" [Prop. VI., Sect. XV.]

"So also many may come to feel the influence of this holy

and divine seed and light, and be turned from evil to good by it, *though they knew nothing of Christ's coming in the flesh*, through whose obedience and sufferings it is purchased unto them." [Id. id.]

"And forasmuch as Christ is called that light that enlightens every man, the light of the world, therefore the light is taken for Christ, who truly is the fountain of light, and hath his habitation in it forever. Thus the *light of Christ is sometimes called Christ*, *i. e.*, that in which Christ is, and from which he is never separated." [Id. id.]

"*That it is by this light, seed or grace that God works the salvation of all men.*" [Id., Sect. XXIV.]

"This *light* appears to be *no power or natural faculty* of man's mind." [Id., Sect. XVI.]

"We are led and moved of the Lord so constantly and frequently to call all, invite all, request all *to turn to the light in them, to mind the light in them, to believe in Christ, as he is in them.*" [Id., Sect. XXIV.]

"So we see how that it is the *inward work*, and not the outward history and scripture, that gives the true knowledge; and by this INWARD LIGHT *many of the heathen philosophers* were sensible of the loss received by Adam, though they knew not the outward history." "Also they *had a knowledge of Jesus Christ inwardly*, as a remedy in them." [Id., Sect. XXVII.]

But I must hasten to conclude these extracts, and refer the candid reader to the authorities themselves, for a further elucidation of this principle of Quakerism.

I would gladly refer to that clear and philosophical disquisition, and illustration of this doctrine, which is published as an appendix to *Sewel's History* of the Quakers, under the title of *The Light on the Candlestick*, and to *Clarkson's Portraiture of Quakerism*, as disinterested and convincing witnesses of the doctrines of Friends as they succeeded in making them known to the larger world outside their own ranks.

The testimony of Robert Barclay, which I have cited, supported as it is by nearly two centuries of approval, brings the doctrine of the Inward Light down to recent times. I will therefore close with a passage or two from late doctrinal writers.

Henry Tuke, in his *Principles*, sets forth this doctrine clearly, in a chapter on the "Influences of the Holy Spirit," "divine grace," or "light," and sums up the matter thus: "1. That *this Grace is of that quality which produceth salvation.* 2. That it *is universal;* not confined to a part of mankind; but extended to all men. 3. That *its instructions are such as invariably lead* to the *practice of piety and virtue.*" [Page 46, Twelfth London Ed.]

Thomas Evans quotes Barclay's Apology at great length, as complete and sufficient authority for the views of Friends on this doctrine; and says in words of his own: "A manifestation of this Spirit they believe is given to every man to profit withal; that it convicts for sin, and, as obeyed, gives power to the soul to overcome and forsake it. It opens to the minds the mysteries of salvation, enables it savingly to understand the truths recorded in the Holy Scriptures, and gives it the living, practical, and heartfelt experience of those things which pertain to its everlasting welfare. They believe that the *saving knowledge of God and Christ cannot be attained in any other way than by the revelation of this Spirit.*" [*Concise Account;* p. 34, 92, *et seq.*]

Elisha Bates, in his *Doctrines of Friends*, adopts the language of Barclay, some of which I have quoted, and enforces the same doctrine at length in his treatise.

And Joseph John Gurney, in his solemn *Declaration of Faith*, made and affirmed before magistrates for one of our

countrymen, uses this language: "It is my firm conviction that as Christ died for all men, so *all men*, through his mediation and sacrifice on the cross, *are placed in a capacity for salvation*, and receive a measure of *divine light*, *which* although in numberless instances 'shining in darkness,' and overborne by ignorance and superstition, *is* in its own nature pure and holy, and *perceptible to the rational mind* of man — so that *those who believe in it*, *and obey it*, *are thereby led to fear God*, *and to keep his law as it is written on their hearts*." [See Appendix to Braithwaite's *Life of J. J. Gurney*, Vol. II., page 594.]

And the same writer, in his *Observations* [page 34, *et seq.*] discourses at length upon this basis of the Apostle's arguments, and the doctrines of Friends, as being that upon which they rest — "*even on that of an inward and universal light*."

And he thus concludes his chapter upon this subject: "We need fear no danger in the Christian doctrine of universal light and grace. On the contrary, a hearty acceptance of it will be one important means of enlarging our hearts and understandings, and of animating and increasing our love both to God and man. Happy shall we be, if we individually discover, from our own experience, the benefit and importance of this precious truth."

I am persuaded that the doctrine of the Inward Light, as taught by this long succession of most discerning and careful writers, is the root and branch and flower of genuine Quakerism; and that any setting forth of the belief of the Society of Friends, which denies, or ignores, or tends to suppress, their clear and sublime testimony to this principle, is unsound and subversive of both the interests of the Society and the cause of truth.

SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

THE

# PRINCIPLES, METHODS AND HISTORY

OF THE

# SOCIETY OF FRIENDS:

AS SHOWN BY

AUGUSTINE JONES,

OF LYNN, MASS.

FIRST DELIVERED, AS A DISCOURSE, IN THE

CHURCH OF THE DISCIPLES, IN BOSTON,

ON FIRST DAY, 2d MO. 8, 1874.

BEING THE

EIGHT OF THE SERIES UPON THE "UNIVERSAL CHURCH."

LYNN, MASS.

PUBLISHED BY GEO. C. HERBERT,

No. 5 CENTRAL AVENUE.

1874.

PRICE, 20 CENTS.

The above, as well as the within pamphlet, will be sent prepaid by the publisher on receipt of price. A large discount to those ordering quantities.

THE

# PRESENT CRISIS

IN THE

# SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

BY

WILLIAM POLLARD.

---

EXTRACTED FROM ARTICLE IN "FRIENDS' QUARTERLY EXAMINER," OF 7TH MO., 1875.

---

BOSTON:
PRESS OF JONES & WHITE, 266 WASHINGTON STREET.
1875.

# THE PRESENT CRISIS

IN THE

# SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

---

THE last sitting of London Yearly Meeting was deeply impressive. We had experienced a time of remarkable favour, and there was need indeed of thanksgiving at the close of the feast. No organ peal or melody of trained voices could have deepened the heartfelt solemnity, or given fuller expression to the reverent thankfulness that rose from that great assembly. No words could have been uttered so eloquent, or so heart-reaching, as that silent hush of hundreds of worshipping men, bowed before the majesty and goodness of Him who still in mercy abides with His Church, and whose presence had been again gratefully recognised and enjoyed. There is one of the "Christian evidences" which no skepticism can shake, and no mere theologian define or understand, and that is the evidence granted to the humbled seeking soul, and to the waiting congregation, of the real presence of Christ by the gentle influence of His Spirit.

The late Yearly Meeting was remarkable for a large amount of religious feeling, in which all classes were favoured to participate, but which strikingly rested upon the young. With many who had long prayed and waited for such a blessing, the thankful recognition of the gathering power of the

Good Shepherd, and the sense of His continued faithfulness and tender compassion, must have been deeper than words could fathom or express. The unsearchable wind of God's Spirit was blowing as it listed, bringing with it, life and health, and showers of blessing; and the young trees of the forest were yielding themselves to its influence, and waving in loving response. How many, in view of it, could say with bowed and thankful hearts "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes!"

At such a time, what need on the part of earnest members of the Church, not only of loving and hopeful sympathy, but of wisdom and patience, and humble confidence in the power of Christ! It is so easy to mar God's work by undue meddling, and by want of faith in the quiet processes of the Divine Spirit. As a rule, it is the silent, almost unnoticed growths and developments of religious life, which are the most permanent and most trustworthy. The plants of God cannot be forced in human hot-houses, without injury to their true vigor and healthy growth. The fact needs frequent reiteration in this day of religious stir, that to apply an undue stimulus to an awakened soul, is often to turn the workings of Divine life into mere emotion and excitement, and thus really to frustrate the grace of God. Is there not some danger in this direction at the present crisis, within even the quiet circle of the Society of Friends?

Doubtless the border-land between well-tempered Christian earnestness and religious excitement is not always to be clearly defined, and when the stirrings of fresh life make themselves manifest, it is not surprising that in certain temperaments there

should be some undue exuberance, some heat without light, which will be cause for anxious thoughtfulness and loving care. So much the more reason that nothing should be done to feed the desire for strong spiritual stimulants, which in the present day is so often a besetment with newly awakened souls. Nor can it be said that the late Yearly Meeting was altogether free from this tendency. It would be invidious and painful to specify particular occasions; but when, as was repeatedly the case, impressionable and sensitive young people are appealed to, over and over again, in urgent terms, to make a public confession of their faith, when they are persistently pressed by the most solemn appeals, to avow their consecration to the Lord, and are even called upon in large meetings to stand up, or to lift up their hands in testimony thereto, we must express our conviction that the Society has come upon ground where the standing is not solid nor safe, nor the atmosphere healthy. We do well to be full of patience and hope over both the exuberance and the inexperience of the new life in Christ; full of thanksgiving that the dead are still raised up, and that to the poor the Gospel is preached; but we incur a grave responsibility if we attempt to force the Divine work.

The mighty Sower is still wonderfully going forth in the world, and, as of old, the seed that springs up first is often that which has "no deepness of earth." With this warning before us, the work of the Church should be to deepen the soil, rather than to force the growth. To do this, we need more faith in Him Who often effects His greatest purposes by quiet and unnoticeable means; Who makes so little use of that which is merely

sensational, that the prophet declares of Him that "He does not strive nor cry, nor cause His voice to be heard in the streets;" but Who, nevertheless, with grand patience and Almighty love, carries on to completeness His own creation by His own methods, in willing and trusting hearts.

Intimately connected with this important subject, is the growing practice of holding during the time of the Yearly Meeting, and on other occasions, a variety of special meetings, sometimes called prayer meetings, sometimes devotional meetings, and sometimes fellowship meetings. It must be cause for unmixed rejoicing that our younger Friends have the wish to meet more often together to seek the blessing of the Lord. Nor can it be doubted that the prevalence of this seeking prayerful spirit has for several years past, most beneficially reacted upon the Meeting at large. There is obviously room in the Church for special meetings, both for fellowship and religious instruction; and the liberty for holding such is large and full. But here, again, we find aspects of the subject which need a most watchful care. It will be well probably to guard against being too sectional and exclusive in the constitution and object of such meetings. The experience of the old and the ardour of the young should both be gathered up and made use of; and in the purpose and direction of the meetings, the Society has a right to expect an unwavering maintenance of the grand Quaker principle, that Christ alone is Head of the Church, and that it is His prerogative, to direct our service and our prayers. To fix that a meeting shall be held for prayer only, or that the worshippers shall be engaged in asking a blessing upon one special object, which is prearranged,

would seem a serious infringement of this great foundation-truth.

It may also be doubted whether the names usually applied to these meetings satisfactorily describe their character. This is a question of some importance, since names not unfrequently come, by degrees, to shape the thing they represent. The difficulty might in this case be met by adopting a term, merely to distinguish and not to describe; and we would suggest for this purpose that such gatherings be known by the simple name of "Special meetings."

But there are graver views of this subject than any involved in either the name or the arrangement, to which we must briefly refer; and while it is not easy to discuss these without incurring the serious risk of being misunderstood, the time has surely come to consider whether, on some of these points, the Society is not drifting into practices and habits which are essentially foreign to its genius and spirit. In a Church without a written creed, great principles may be gradually lost by *drifting*, and a few pointed inquiries may direct thought and care to the tendency of this drift on one special subject in the present day. Is the ordinary "prayer-meeting," as held among other Christians, and which some have been long seeking to plant among Friends,—a faithful and safe exponent of the nature and purpose of true prayer? Is a company of earnest Friends likely to be truly helped,—are their souls likely to be edified and refreshed—is their faith in the presence of Christ likely to be strengthened and confirmed, by ten, twenty, thirty, or even, as has been sometimes the case, fifty utterances in prayer during one sitting? Is the sense of person-

al responsibility in every soul, and the genuineness of every prayer, likely to be maintained thereby? On the other hand, is the secret yearning of the contrite heart, the unspoken prayer, the lifting up of the soul to God, of so little avail, that this high premium must be put everywhere upon the offering of the lips? These are grave and perhaps startling inquiries, the importance of which may some day be more fully seen. In making them we would plead for no restriction or repression conceived in the spirit of bigoted attachment to the arrangements of the past; but believing principles to be unchangeable, we do plead for that which is genuine and healthy, and natural, the true growth of the Divine Spirit.

We cannot but think that the effect of this high premium on vocal prayer is already apparent in our ordinary meetings for worship. This seems to be a day of long prayers; but how rarely is a long prayer fully and powerfully sustained! William Penn in writing of George Fox, and of his wonderful gift in prayer, speaks emphatically of "the fewness and fulness of his words;" the reverence and solemnity of his address and behaviour." In no invidious or fault-finding spirit, we would solemnly ask if the present craving in the Society for much vocal prayer, is calculated to promote the healthy and reverent development of this invaluable gift in the Church?

It is always a more cheerful and comfortable work to swim with the tide of popular opinion in the movements of the day; but the strong tendency to extremes, so apparent of late time, seems to demand the word of caution and of warning, as to the direction of the current which has got hold of

us. It has been said that "a live Methodist is better than a dead Quaker," and judging from what is passing round us, this truism may almost be accepted as the moving principle of those who are so actively stimulating the fresh religious feeling which is undoubtedly existing amongst us. The results of a policy apparently founded on this indisputable axiom, are strikingly described by an impartial writer (not a Friend), who attended a recent Yearly Meeting in Indiana. He says, "It is evident to a careful observer, that sentimental religion is displacing, to some extent, the practical and genuine characteristics which have given the Society of Friends its *prestige* and influence!" If there is any truth in this statement we should be guilty of something worse than error, to neglect the warning which it implies.

But without saying a word against "live Methodism," which has done, and is doing, good work in the world; and certainly without offering a syllable of defence for "dead Quakerism," which is dismal death itself, we are yet happy in the belief that these are not the only alternatives; that living, old-fashioned Quakerism—calm, patient, full of both genuine zeal and staying power, not needing the incessant application of human stimulants—is not to be regarded as hopelessly extinct, nor its work among the Churches complete. As a Society we have still a calling and service, and these are not likely to be promoted by the mere imitation of other religious bodies, however zealous and successful they may be.

As a part of the same tendency to which we have had so largely to refer, we must say a word on the growing disposition, as it seems to us, to indulge in too much theology. There are many who think

they see this in much of the ministry of the present day—in the public offerings in prayer, and even in the General Epistle. It was often apparent in the deliberations of the Yearly Meeting, especially in the hot debate on the word "fundamental." It turned one of its large meetings for worship into a time of painful controversy, in which extremes on one side begot extremes on the other, until the only comfort left for those who sought to be worshippers, was the knowledge that we were in the hands of One Who is Truth itself, Who is not exacting in dogma, and Who can and will really speak to the condition of the seeking soul.

The strength of our religious body, as it seems to us, is not in the inculcation of creeds, or elaborate theological systems, which are often the mere uninspired inferences of fallible men; but in the loving recognition and promotion of the work of Christ in the soul, by the power of His Spirit. The faith that seeks to bring people, not to this or that doctrine, but to Christ Himself, and is content "to leave them there," to grow in grace and knowledge under His Divine influence, is a catholic and sound faith though it is not one that is pleasing to the busy theological mind.

There is a further view closely connected with this subject, and which came up during the Yearly Meeting, to which we must briefly refer. It was repeatedly implied during the discussion on the Eleventh Query, and at other times, that the Society of Friends differs from many other religious bodies, upon secondary questions only. The Query itself seems to assume as much, where it speaks of "promoting the religious instruction of our younger members in fundamental Christian truth, *and* in the Scriptural grounds of our religious principles."

The proposition from Durham runs somewhat in the same direction. To some of us this estimate of the Society's standing comes as the beginning of a "new departure," and one full of many anxious forebodings. How it is possible for any one to read the Journal of Fox or the Memoir of Grellet—the man of the seventeenth, or the man of the nineteenth century—and come to the conclusion that these servants of Christ differed from many other good men on secondary matters only, is a wonder indeed!

In one sense it is undoubtedly true that all sincere worshippers of God are of the same faith, or, as William Penn expresses it, "The humble, meek, merciful, just, pious, and devout souls are everywhere of one religion." But a comprehensive view like this, which would include the Mahometan, the Unitarian, and the Catholic in the same fraternity, if all fearing God, and working righteousness, is not the meaning of those who would base the Society on secondary Truth. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the tendency of their view is to narrowness rather than breadth, and that it leads almost to a negation of the great neglected truth which Fox and Barclay revived.

The leaders of the Evangelical sects—Baxter and Bunyan and the rest—never admitted that the fathers of Quakerism were in harmony with themselves as regards primary Christian doctrine. The Friends themselves were equally uncompromising. They differed essentially both in the inception and the presentation of Truth. They differed almost radically in their view of fundamental truth. It may be easy to cite disjointed sentences from one or the other Quaker writer to prove the contrary, but the fact is patent in their teaching, and cannot

be controverted. The Evangelical sects declared, and still declare, their foundation-truth to be the Death of Christ. The Friends, going wider and deeper, avow that their foundation-truth is Christ Himself,—the Living Saviour,—the same yesterday, to-day, and forever! And, as regards the Friends, this was no shadowy difference of terms and words, but a distinction, vital, and influential, in their whole teaching.

Their religion was thus pre-eminently simple in its character. It began at the beginning. It was not clogged and mystified with theological verbiage. It appealed to a power that could be known and felt, and as such it had a wonderful success. They who practised it ignored no revealed truth; the human life of Christ,—His death, His resurrection, His ascension, all for our sakes,—they thankfully accepted and believed. But Christ the Living, the Indivisible, He who had been God manifest in the flesh, and is now God manifest in the Spirit, was their foundation Rock. His enlightening grace, His deliverance from sin, His qualifying guiding power, His sustaining influence and abiding peace, they richly realised and earnestly proclaimed.

If we, their descendants, are willing in this time of gracious visitation, to come under the same preparing hand, and to be governed and endowed by the same Spirit, there is good hope that we shall yet be permitted to share abundantly in their labours and their success. We have a place and a work allotted to us among the tribes of the spiritual Israel, as have other branches of the Church of Christ. As such, we may safely leave the propagation of Methodism to the Methodists themselves,—and in all faithfulness mind our own calling.